



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LEGEND OF THE TROJAN SETTLEMENT IN LATIUM

By GORDON J. LAING
The University of Chicago

I have undertaken an examination of this question because it seems to me that in many discussions of it the nature of the relation between the legend and the cult of Aphrodite is stated in a misleading way. That there is a connection between the two is true; but that it is not to the cult that we must look for the ultimate origin of the legend I shall endeavor to show. My paper consists of two parts: I, a summary and criticism of the most important passages in ancient authors referring to the legend, and II, a discussion of the theories of its origin.

I

The first reference that bears upon the question is the well-known prophecy of Poseidon in *Iliad* xx. 302 ff., on the occasion of the duel between Achilles and Aeneas:

μόριμον δέ οῖ ἐστ' ἀλέασθαι,
ὅφρα μὴ ἀσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὅληται
Δαρδάνου,

and again, *ibid.*, 307, 8:

νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει
καὶ παιδῶν παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.¹

Here we have in all probability a *vaticinium ex eventu*, indicating that at the time of its composition there was reigning in the Troad

¹ “And ‘t is the will of fate
That he escape; that so the Dardan race,
Beloved by Jove above all others sprung
From him and mortal women, may not yet
Perish from earth and leave no progeny.
For Saturn’s son already holds the house
Of Priam in disfavor, and will make
Aeneas ruler o’er the men of Troy,
And his son’s sons shall rule them after him.”

a dynasty that claimed descent from Aeneas.¹ There is no hint in the passage of an emigration on the part of Aeneas and his followers. Strabo (xiii. 1. 53) refers to these verses and points out the discrepancy between the account given in them and the story that Aeneas emigrated to Italy. Virgil turns the prophecy to the glory of the Julian gens in *Aeneid* iii. 97:

Hic domus Aeneae cunctis dominabitur oris
Et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis.

Arctinus of Miletus also, the Cyclic poet, says nothing of an emigration of Aeneas, if we may judge from the extracts of his work preserved in the *Chrestomathy* of Proclus. Moreover, if there had been a reference to such an event in any of his poems, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who knew them (i. 69), would not have failed to mention it. The account given by Arctinus (in his 'Ιλίου Πέρσις) is that Aeneas left the city immediately after the Laocoön disaster, and withdrew to Mount Ida. This was the version Sophocles used in his *Laocoön*, possibly going back to Arctinus as his source.

Of Peisander, from whom according to Macrobius (*Sat.* v. 2. 4) Virgil is said to have drawn the second book of the *Aeneid*, we know nothing definite. So far as our information goes, there is no work by Peisander of Cameirus to which the reference could be, and it is hard to believe that Macrobius could have imagined that Peisander of Laranda, who lived in the first half of the third century A.D., was older than Virgil. In any case the end of the second book takes us only as far as the withdrawal of Aeneas to the mountain. Dionysius does not mention Peisander.

The name of Stesichorus is of especial importance for our question, because many have believed that the earliest traces of the myth of the settlement in Italy are to be found in his work. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte* (I, 201), says that Stesichorus sang of Aeneas' wanderings "fast wie Vergil," basing his belief on the representation of the Iliac Table of the Capitol. Mommsen also (*History of Rome*, Eng. transl., I, 594), Wörner in Roscher's *Lexikon*, and Rossbach in Pauly-Wissowa, while they do not go so far as Niebuhr, express confidence in the evidence of the Table. The

¹ See Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte*, I, 199, and Monro in his note on the passage.

scene depicted there (see the facsimile in *Corp. Inscript. Gr.*, III, 6125, or the reproduction in Daremberg and Saglio's dictionary) is the departure of Aeneas from his native shore: he is holding Ascanius by the hand, behind him is the trumpeter Misenus, in front Anchises with the *sacra*, and they are in the act of embarking. The inscription given on the Table is "Aeneas setting out for the West." This is only one of many scenes on the Table. The sources from which the maker has drawn are given in the spaces between the scenes: the *Iliad* of Homer, the *Aethiopis* of the Milesian Arctinus, the *Little Iliad* of Lesches, and the *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus. We know enough about the content of the first three to eliminate them as sources for the scene we are discussing, and the assumption that it goes back to Stesichorus seems reasonably well based. This assumption is not invalidated by the fact that the Table is a Roman production, belonging possibly to the early imperial period. Neither Preller (*Römische Mythologie*, Jordan's ed., II, 314) nor Nissen (*Jahrbücher*, XCI, 378) has established the contention that the representations are so largely influenced by the form of the legend at the time of their composition that they are untrustworthy as sources. The vagueness of the phrase "For the West"¹ tends to indicate an honest use of sources. On the other hand, that same phrase, pointing in so general a way to Italy or Sicily, prevents belief in the view of Niebuhr stated above. Stesichorus probably brought Aeneas to Italy, but there is nothing to show that he connected him with Latium.

So far there is no mention of the settlement in Latium. Dionysius (i. 72) cites as an ancient testimony for the founding of Rome by the Trojans the account of Cephalion, of Gergis, a town in the Troad. According to his story Aeneas himself died in Thrace, but Romus, one of his sons, led the Trojans to Italy and founded Rome. This evidence, however, turns out to be untrustworthy. We find on inquiry that but little confidence can be placed in Dionysius' claims of antiquity for many of his authorities, and we are distinctly told by Athenaeus (ix. 393) that the book on Troy passing under Cephalion's name was written by an Alexandrian of the third century B.C.

¹ εἰς τὴν Ἐσπερίαν.

The so-called *Chronicle of the Argive Priestesses* (Dionysius i. 72), attributed to Hellanicus, an older contemporary of Herodotus, is likewise open to criticism. The account there given is that Aeneas along with Odysseus, passing through the country of the Thracians and Molossians, came finally to Italy, where he founded a city which he called Rome after the name of one of the Trojan women with him. It is noticeable that we have here a crossing of the myths of Aeneas and Odysseus, which is common in the later forms of the story. This chronicle may be, as Preller suggests, a later version of the original chronicle of Hellanicus.

It is probably in the story of Aristotle, cited by Dionysius (i. 72), that we have the first mention of a Trojan settlement in Latium. His version is that an Achaean squadron, cast away upon the shores of Latium, was set on fire by Trojan female slaves, and that the Latins originated from these Achaeans, who were thus compelled to stay there, and their Trojan wives.

From this time on we see in the Greek writers much more definite outlines of the form which the story subsequently took. Calilius of Syracuse, for instance, who wrote about 300 B.C., tells us of the settlement of the Trojans in Latium and of their union with the aborigines. Roma, one of the Trojan women, marries King Latinus and their children are Romus, Romulus, and Telegonus.

A much more important name in Dionysius' muster of authorities is that of Timaeus of Tauromenium in Sicily (*ca. 352-256 B.C.*). Mommsen speaks of him as "having really completed the conception subsequently current of the Trojan emigration." He represents Aeneas as founding first Lavinium with its shrine of the Trojan Penates, and then Rome. He writes (Dionysius i. 67) that he himself had heard from the people of Lavinium that the images of the Trojan gods were preserved in the sanctuary of the temple. He even gives an exact inventory of the sacred vessels. He certainly cannot be charged with lack of definiteness of statement. As further evidence of Rome's Trojan origin he is said to have cited the sacrifice of the *October equus* by the Romans in the Campus Martius, explaining it as a memorial of the taking of Troy by the wooden horse (see Polyb. xii. 4b). To him also is attributed the belief expressed by Pausanias (*Att. xii*) that

King Pyrrhus felt it incumbent upon him, as a descendant of Aeacus, to make war upon the Romans, whose origin was Trojan. It is quite clear that the critical element entered but scantily into Timaeus' conception of historiography. Polybius tells us that he is untrustworthy, especially when he appeals to documentary evidence, and Mommsen describes him as one of those men who upon no matter are so well informed as upon the unknowable. Nevertheless his testimony is of importance. So far as our question is concerned, it makes but little difference whether his story is largely the result of his own inventive faculty or whether he is reproducing the current version of his time.

From Timaeus on, the belief in the Trojan settlement in Latium is universal among the Greeks.

Turning now to the Latin side, when first do we find this belief in a Trojan origin among the Romans? Wörner (in Roscher's *Lexikon*) places the first coming of the story to Latium toward the end of the sixth century B.C. Preller remarks (II, 315) that the legend gives one the impression of a total eclipse of the Latin alliances and so must have arisen some time after the final subjugation of the Latins in 338 B.C. Both these views, however, are largely speculative. All that can be said is that the story seems to have been well established about the time of the first Punic War (264–241). In Justinus (28.1) we have the record of an early official recognition of it: "Acarnes quoque diffisi Epirotis adversus Aetolos auxilium Romanorum implorantes obtinuerunt a Romano senatu ut legati mitterentur, qui denuntiarent Aetolis, praesidia ab urbibus Acarnaniae deducerent paterenturque liberos esse, qui soli quondam adverus *Troianos*, *auctores originis suaे*, auxilia Graecis non miserunt." The date of this embassy is not certain. It may have taken place as early as 238 B.C.; in any case it was not later than 224. There do not seem to me to be any reasonable grounds for Nissen's distrust of the accuracy of Justinus' statement. In Suetonius (*Claud.* 25) we have another example of state recognition of the belief: "Iliensibus, quasi Romanae gentis auctoribus, tributa in perpetuum remisit, recitata vetere epistola Graeca senatus populique Romani Seleuco regi amicitiam et societatem ita demum pollicentis, si consanguineos

suos Ilienses ab omni onere immunes praestitisset." Mommsen puts this *epistola* in 282 B.C.; Nissen, between 247 and 225. The Ilians were also included by the Romans in the first treaty with Macedonia in 205 B.C.; and later, in 190 B.C., when the Scipios crossed the Hellespont, the Ilians boasted of their colony the Roman people, and the Romans, greeting the Troad as their mother country, offered sacrifice to Athene (see Livy xxxvii. 37).

As to the place of the story in Roman literature, it is Naevius in his *Bellum Punicum* who first makes use of it. We may see something of his treatment in the fragments preserved (Baehrens, *Fragm. Poet. Rom.*, 43 ff.). Fragment 5 tells of the flight of Aeneas and Anchises from the city:

eorum sectam sequuntur multi mortales.

Fragment 4 is a picture of the flight of the women:

amborum uxores
noctu Troiade exhibant capitibus opertis,
flentes ambae, abeuntes lacrimis cum multis.

Fragment 11: their departure on a vessel which Mercury built for them; Fragment 13: the storm and the complaint of Venus to Jupiter, which Virgil afterward used. It is also generally assumed that Naevius first brought Aeneas to Carthage and introduced the Dido episode into the story.¹ It is not, however, certain that Fragment 24 refers to Dido:

blande et docte percontat Aenea quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquisset.

Baehrens thinks the reference is to the *hospes Latinus*.

Ennius told the story in detail at the beginning of his *Annales*. In Fabius Pictor we find mention of the prodigies by which Aeneas was guided to the site of the city. (See Peter, p. 8, Frag. 4.) Cato also related the story of Aeneas' coming to Latium. Cassius Hemina in his *Annales* went back to the emigration of Aeneas and his settlement in Latium. (See Peter, p. 69.) Varro tells of Aeneas' escape to the citadel of Troy and says that when the Greeks agreed to let him and his followers depart with as much as each man could carry, instead of loading himself with treasure he carried off his father; and on being granted a second choice,

¹ See Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, 114.

the images of the gods (Servius on *Aeneid* ii. 636). It is Varro also who relates that the morning star was visible to the Romans during their voyage, disappearing only when they reached the Laurentian coast. (See Servius *Aeneid* i. 381; ii. 801; and Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, I, 275.) In Livy the wanderings from Troy to Italy are treated very summarily (i. 1. 4): "primo in Macedoniam venisse, inde in Siciliam . . . ab Sicilia . . . ad Laurentem agrum." Virgil's version need hardly be given.

II

It is not necessary to discuss the question of the historical or non-historical character of the story. Practically no one now believes that it is historical. But even assuming that it is a myth, its origin is a matter of interest, and on this point there has been a great deal of discussion and a wide divergence of opinion. Niebuhr (*Röm. Gesch.*, I, 210) sees in it simply the expression of the affinity of the Trojans and the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians. Everything, he claims, which we find in the old mythological stories indicates the relationship which existed between the Trojan and the Pelasgic tribes—the Arcadians, Epirots, Oenotrians, but especially the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians; and the alleged expedition of the Trojans to Latium and the wanderings of the Tyrrhenians to Lemnos, Imbros, and the Hellespont are to be interpreted as denoting nothing but this relationship. The first objection to this theory is that it explains very little, and in the second place the grounds on which Niebuhr assumes the kinship seem insufficient. For example, he cites the story in Dionysius i. 68 of Dardanus being of Arcadian origin, and mentions that Corythus is a Tyrrhenian in Virgil and a Trojan in Hellanicus and Cephalion.

Very different is the opinion of Otfr. Müller.¹ His theory is that the Aeneas story owes its origin to the introduction of the Sibylline prophecies into Rome under the Tarquins. He argues that there is good reason for supposing that the Sibylline books stood in close relation to Aeneas and the Aeneas story, citing Dionysius i. 49: "The coming of Aeneas and the Trojans to Italy is attested by prophecies of the Sibyl, oracles of Delphi, and many other

¹ *The Classical Journal*, XXVI, 210 ff.

kinds of evidence"; and *ibid.*, i. 55: "The Sibyl bade them sail toward the West until they should come to a place where they should eat their tables"; and the verses of Tibullus ii. 5.19 f.: *haec (Sibylla) dedit Aeneae sortes*, etc. These citations, he claims, support the theory that Aeneas' name had a prominent place in the prophecies, and the history of the oracles is pressed into service to show how this happened. It is urged that all the collections of Greek Sibylline prophecies are to be traced back to the Sibyl whose abode was in one of the ravines of Mount Ida; that we are informed by Herodotus that a remnant of the Trojan race still existed in the valleys of Ida after the war; and that the Aeneadae ruled over them we know from Homer, Strabo, and others. It is, therefore, Müller argues, highly probable that that remnant of the Trojans would hope for a revival of their national greatness under the leadership of the Aeneadae and that the oracles of the local Sibyl would give expression to these hopes, promising to the race of the Aeneadae the favor of the gods, increase of kingdom, and dominion over all peoples. He then attempts to show that the Roman Sibylline books are of pure Trojan origin and, to clinch his theory, points to the high place they held in the faith of the Roman people, who believed they read in them their own destiny. All that the Sibyl had predicted for the race of the Aeneadae they appropriated to themselves: the promised New Ilium was Rome; the kingdom of the Aeneadae was the empire of Rome; the race of the Aeneadae was the Roman people; and when this parallel had once become established in the minds of the Romans, it was but a step to the belief that the Romans were actually the descendants of Trojans.

This theory, plausible as it is, proves on closer examination to be unworthy of credence. It must be rejected for the reason that the assumption upon which it is ultimately based—that the Sibylline prophecies to which Dionysius refers so confidently are of pure Trojan origin and so uninfluenced by the current beliefs of the day—is without support of definite evidence.

Another explanation of the myth is offered by Bamberger in *Rhein. Mus.*, VI, 82-105. Differing from Müller, he insists that Lavinium, not Rome, was the starting-point of the story. This

too is the view of Hild in his *Légende d'Énée*. Bamberger thinks that the origin of the myth is to be found in the worship of the Penates at Lavinium. He contends that this was a widely extended Pelasgic cult, but being attributed to Aeneas it gave rise to the story. He does not, however, satisfactorily establish the Pelasgic character of the worship of the Penates. That Lavinium is the starting-point of the myth is the view also of Schwegler, who treats the whole question at some length in his *Römische Geschichte*, I, 279 ff. Dilating on Lavinium as the religious capital of Latium and citing the various records of religious associations that clung around it all through its history (Varro *L.L.* v. 144; Macrobius iii. 4. 11; Livy v. 52), he points out what seems to him the special suitability of Aeneas, famous as the preserver of the *sacra* of Troy, to be the founder of a city of such sacred connections.

Preller treats the question in his *Römische Mythologie*, II, 310–34 (Jordan's ed., 1883). His view is that the origin of the Aeneas myth is to be found in the close connection which existed from the time of Homer between Aphrodite and Aeneas; that the story of Aeneas' wanderings resulted from the diffusion of the Aphrodite cult. This view Roscher also advocates in his *Lexikon*. The wide extension of the cult of Aphrodite, Preller points out, is due mainly to her function as a goddess of the sea and of seafaring. (See Roscher, *Studien zur Griech. Myth.*, Heft 3, p. 54.) In this capacity we find her with the epithet *Aīveiás*. So linked together, the cult and the fable may be traced from place to place. It is not, as the story runs, Aeneas who has visited this place and that, and built a temple to his mother Aphrodite, but it is the introduction of the Aphrodite cult that inevitably brings with it a host of Aeneas associations.

This is the theory that has today the widest currency. It does not, however, as it seems to me, square with the facts as we know them. In the first place, we cannot study the cult of Aphrodite without observing that the part played by Aeneas in that cult or in legends connected with it is relatively small. It is so small that we must rule out at once the assumption that the establishment of the cult of the goddess in a place would necessarily lead to the introduction of legends of Aeneas and of Troy. Anyone

who doubts this should glance at a conspectus of the Aphrodite cult, e.g., that given by Dümmler in the first volume of the *Real-Encyclopädie* of Pauly-Wissowa. We shall not all accept Dümmler's view on the question of the direction of the diffusion of the cult; but whether we believe with him that the worship originated in Thessaly and spread from that region to the South, East, and West, or whether we accept the more common view that it came from the East and spread across the islands of the Aegean to the mainland of Greece, we cannot but be impressed not only by its enormous extension but also by the variety of cult titles under which the goddess was worshiped. If the connection between Aphrodite and Aeneas were as close as seems sometimes to be assumed, we should have legends of Aeneas connected with temples of Aphrodite in five hundred places instead of in fifty. In other words, there are hundreds of sites on which the cult of Aphrodite flourished where we have no trace of Aeneas. Nor can we accept that modification of the theory which we find stated tentatively in Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States* (II, 638 ff.) that "the story of the wanderings of Aeneas may be the legendary record of the diffusion of the cult of Aphrodite Aineias." The various legends of Aeneas' wanderings mention fifty or more places where he landed. A majority of these show traces of the worship of Aphrodite, but in only four or five is there any vestige of the special cult of 'Αφροδίτη Αἰνείας.

Enough has been said to show that the cult of Aphrodite and the legend of Aeneas are not in any sense coextensive. This fact, however, does not prove that the legend is not derived from the cult. The only way to get light on the question is to examine some specific examples of places where the two are found together. Let us take, first of all, the case of Latium itself. It is stated by Strabo that there was in the neighborhood of Ardea and Lavinium a temple of Aphrodite which was a common sanctuary for the cities of the Latin league. It was this temple, according to Rossbach (in Pauly-Wissowa) and others, that first gave rise to the story that Aeneas landed on the coast of Latium. An examination of this particular case leads to the conclusion that the basis for the belief is extremely flimsy. In the first place we know nothing about the

age of the temple, and in the second place there is no evidence that it was a temple of the Greek goddess Aphrodite. It may have been a temple of the Italic Venus. The fact that it was a common sanctuary for the Latins tends to favor the latter view. Of the existence of a cult of Venus in Italy long before the introduction of the worship of Aphrodite we have clear evidence. In regard to the cults at Alba and at Gabii the same doubt exists: we do not know how far back the foundations go and we cannot find out whether it was the Italic Venus or the Greek Aphrodite that was worshiped there. In Rome there was no cult of the Greek goddess till 217 B.C., when after the battle of Trasumenes a temple to Venus Erycina was vowed by Q. Fabius Maximus. The temple was dedicated two years later. As Wissowa has pointed out in his *De Veneris Simulacris Romanis* (p. 7), everything connected with that foundation indicates that it marked the first introduction of the cult of the Greek goddess into Rome. Of temples to the Italic Venus the first recorded in the Fasti is dated 295 B.C. The temple mentioned by Festus (p. 265), however, is probably older.

To sum up, then, there is on the one side the fact that there is no evidence of the cult of Aphrodite having been introduced into Latium before 217 B.C., and on the other hand there is the fact, established by the quotations from ancient authors given in the first part of this paper, that the story of the Trojans in Latium is at least as old as the fourth century B.C. Under these circumstances it is clear that we cannot point to any cult of Aphrodite in Latium as the source of the legend.

In the case of Sicily the situation is different. There, especially in the northwestern corner of the island, there are clear traces of the association of Aeneas and Aphrodite. Upon our determination of the nature of this relation will depend largely our conclusion in regard to the origin and significance of the whole myth. First of all it is important to distinguish between a cult, as it was originally practiced, and the legends which local annalists or poets, for purposes of their own, wove about it. Our problem here in Sicily is to decide whether the natural development of the cult of Aphrodite on that site involved Aeneas' name or legends connected with

his name, which writers afterward turned into stories of the foundation of cities and temples; or whether the story of the hero's wanderings, already current in the Mediterranean world, was used by these settlements for their own aggrandizement, and became established because the presence of the temple of the goddess-mother served to give some color to the story. To decide this question we must investigate (1) the history of the cult of Aphrodite on this site and (2) the foundation-stories told about the cities of the region. An examination of (1) shows that there is nothing in the history of the cult itself which indicates that the Aeneas legend formed an integral part of it. Such evidence as there is tends in the other direction. This part of Sicily was settled by the Elymians, a people, as Freeman in his *History of Sicily*, I, 197, points out, of extremely doubtful racial affinities: "They were, in the Greek sense, barbarians. The alleged Greek intermixture was either so little believed or was held to be so slight as not to take them out of that class. But they are barbarians who stand alone; they are not Sikan; they are not Sikel; they are not Phoenician; there is nothing to tell us whence they came." Their two chief cities were Segesta and Eryx. On the top of Mt. Eryx which towered above the town was a great temple. This temple was the earliest foundation on the spot; the town seems to have grown up around it. As we do not know anything about the religion of the Elymians, it is impossible to say what divinity was first worshiped in the temple. It was probably only after Phoenician influence became dominant in the neighborhood that the cult of Ashtoreth —the Phoenician Aphrodite—was established there. One thing, however, seems fairly certain, namely, that the cult was first established under its Phoenician name and in its Phoenician form. Now the Aeneas legend has never been connected with the name of Ashtoreth, and so it is safe to conclude that at the introduction of the cult there were no associations with Aeneas. If the Aeneas legend came in through the instrumentality of the cult, it could have come only after the name of Ashtoreth had been changed to that of Aphrodite, and we must assume that at that time the name of Aeneas, in one form or another, had a place in her worship. There do not, however, seem to be good grounds for this assumption.

Those who argue in favor of it point to the altar of Ἀφροδίτη Αἰνείας at Eryx and to the temple of Aeneas at Segesta. But there is not the slightest evidence to show that the altar and the temple are earlier than the date at which the legend of his wanderings became current. If we had only the altar to deal with, it might be as easy to say that the altar gave rise to the fable of Aeneas' visit as to say that the fable resulted in the altar. But as Freeman has pointed out, the temple of Aeneas at Segesta—the only temple of Aeneas of which we have record—on its most obvious interpretation, seems to imply the previous existence of the legend. In a word, the monuments in northwestern Sicily furnish no definite evidence that the association of Aeneas with Aphrodite in forms of worship antedates the story of his wanderings.

The same may be said of the sanctuaries of Ἀφροδίτη Αἰνείας at Leucas and Actium. Eduard Meyer (*Geschichte des Altertums*, II, §277), who believes that this cult title is of great antiquity and that the name *Aineias* is derived from it, does not produce any evidence which supports his view. Aeneas' name, he says, comes from this cult title just as Odysseus' name is derived from a cult title of Poseidon. Those who accept this theory of the origin of the Odysseus legend will probably accept his view of the Aeneas question. It is true that the name does occur not infrequently on Arcadian sites, but the occurrences are in all probability later than the story of the wanderings. They are apparently not earlier than the time of the writer Araithos who is the chief source for the Arcadian form of the Aeneas legend and who probably belongs to the fourth century B.C.

Let us look now at the foundation-stories told about Eryx and Segesta and see whether there is a probability of the legend having come to Sicily in that form. The evidence at hand seems to me to indicate a strong probability that this was the case. The eagerness of cities in various parts of the Mediterranean basin, especially in the West, to attain standing and dignity by claiming as founders heroes of the Trojan War is so well known that it does not require demonstration. Many of them claimed Greek heroes.¹

¹ See the list of examples given by Grote, *History of Greece*, I, chap. xv.

Others, who could not hope to establish a title to a Greek origin, claimed Trojan founders. This, apparently, is what Eryx and Segesta did. Moreover, it is of great importance for our inquiry to note that Aeneas is not the only Trojan who plays a part in the legendary history of that region. Passing over the story of Thucydides who simply states that the first settlers at Eryx and Segesta were Trojans who came after the taking of Troy, we have the narratives of Lykophron and Dionysius, who tell us that Segesta was founded by Aigestos, son of the daughter of the Trojan Phoinodamas who lived in the time of King Laomedon. When the war broke out Aigestos went back to Troy to help his kinsmen against the Greeks, subsequently returning to Sicily with one Elymus, a son of Anchises. In one version Aeneas is not even mentioned; in another Aigestos is said to have entertained him on his way to Italy and by his help to have founded the cities of Aigesta (Segesta) and Eryx. I lay some stress on this story because it shows clearly that there were influences at work—quite independently of any religious cult—which directed the claims of these western cities toward Troy.

In conclusion, the most probable explanation of the story of Aeneas' wanderings is that poets and annalists, building on the tradition that he escaped from Troy, which as we have seen is as old as Homer, invented a tale of wanderings after the manner of their kind; and this story was used by ambitious settlements in various parts of the Mediterranean in furthering their claims to a heroic founder. The story became current independently of the diffusion of the cult of Aphrodite. The contribution of the cult to the legend was that it served to localize it in certain places, just as accidental similarity of name localized it in others. (Cf. the case of the city of Aineia in Chalcidice.) In a comparatively few places the coincidence of legend and cult resulted in the association of Aeneas and Aphrodite in religious ceremonies, and from this association came the cult title, *'Αφροδίτη Αἰνειάς*, with which the title Zeus-Agamemnon may be compared.¹ In Latium, however, it is especially worthy of note, the legend is wholly free from the influence of any local cult of Aphrodite.

¹ Cf. also Apollo-Asklepios, and Poseidon-Erechtheus. See Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, II, 638 ff.